

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) by the European patent document to Barbarti.

Claims 1-7 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the German document DE 70042 in view of the U.S. patent to Suzuki and Randall.

Also, claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the U.S. patent to Collins in view of the patents to Suzuki and Randall.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112.

In connection with the Examiner's rejection of the claims, applicant canceled claim 4 and amended claim 1 by introducing into it substantially the features of claim 4, and also by making some minor changes.

It is respectfully submitted that the new features of the present invention as defined in the amended claim 1 are not disclosed in the references and can not be derived from it as a matter of obviousness.

The patent to Barbarti does not disclose a preassembled coil frame which is integrally extruded on the pole shoe and slid onto the stator pole tooth. The patent to Barbarti discloses a pole shoe 10 with an outwardly oriented portion in form of radial tooth 11. The pole shoe 10 is covered by co-molding a layer of electrically insulating material 12, as explained in column 2, lines 28-33. This serves for holding the shoes in a star-like arrangement as explained in column 2, line 34. Afterwards, a coil 16 is wound around the tooth 11, as disclosed in column 3, lines 10-15 and lines 43-44. Thus, the reference clearly teaches not to extrude a coil frame integrally with a pole shoe, preassemble a coil, and then slide it onto the stator tooth.

It is therefore believed to be clear that the patent to Barbarti neither anticipates the present invention as defined in amended claim 1, nor renders it obvious. Claim 1 as amended should be considered as patentably distinguishing over this reference.

The German patent document DE 420 and the U.S. patent to Suzuki, Collins and Randall also do not teach the new features of the present invention. None of the references teaches coil frames integrally extruded on pole shoes. They all disclose separate coil frames.

Claim 1 therefore defines the features which are patentably distinguishing over these references as well.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 1, the broadest claim on file, should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.


As for the dependent claims, these claims depend on claim 1, they share its presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that they should be allowed as well.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in

formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233